UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/645,896	08/25/2000	Jeffrey J. Gold	PD-200223	6089

7590 11/18/2004	EXAMINER
John A. Artz, Esq.	STEVENS, THOMAS H
Artz Artz	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2123	

John A. Artz, Esq.
Artz Artz
28333 Telegraph Road
Suite 250
Southfield, MI 48034

DATE MAILED: 11/18/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>21 October 2004</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-15</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-15</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>15 October 2004</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received

        application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not receiv

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Su[...]
Paper No(s)[...]

5)☐ Notice of I[...]

6)☐ Other: __[...]

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-15 were examined

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly
> claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

3.   Regarding claims 1,3, 5,7,12, the word "unique" renders the claims indefinite

because the claims includes elements not actually disclosed, thereby rendering the

scope of the claims unascertainable. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148

USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining

obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

  1.   Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.

  2.   Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.

  3.   Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.

  4.   Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating

       obviousness or nonobviousness.

5.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6.   Claims 1,2,6, 7-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.103 (a) as being unpatentable by

Durst et al. ("TCP Extensions for Space Communications" (1997)) in view of Priore ("A

General Purpose Data Processing System Simulator for Satellite Ground Stations

(1997)) and in view of Gold et al. (U.S. Patent 5,808,921 (1998)). Durst et al. teaches

the testing sets of protocols for use in space data communication, known as Space

Communications Protocol Standards (SCPS); but Durst et al. does not teach simulation

of other space orbital properties. Priore teaches a method to model a general class of

automatic data processing functions for satellite ground stations, while Gold et al.

teaches a system for testing an embedded control processor (i.e., emulated spacecraft

control processor and simulation engine) for a spacecraft control processor (abstract).

At the time the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in

the art to use Priore and Gold et al. to modify Durst et al. because of the significant

financial expense of using actual equipment to model daily intergalactic activities.

Claim 1. A method of simulating the operation of a spacecraft comprising the steps of

(Gold: abstract): requesting a connection to one of a plurality of simulated ground

stations (Gold: column 4, lines 45-50); generating a range server name corresponding

to one of the plurality of simulated ground stations (Priore: abstract); in response to the

range server name, generating server location parameters (Priore: pg. 270-271,

Problem Solution section, lines 1-8 and 1-7, respectively); instantiating a range

server(Priore: pg. 270-271, Problem Solution section, lines 1-8 and 1-7, respectively)

dedicated to a single ground station (Priore: pg. 273, section DPSSGS MODEL

OVERVIEW, with pg. 272, figure 1); calculating simulated range data for each of the

plurality of simulated ground stations in response to a unique port address (Durst: pg.

389, Introduction, 2nd paragraph, with pg. 392, figure 1).

Claim 2. A method as recited in claim 1(Gold: column 4, lines 45-50; Priore: pg. 270-

271, Problem Solution section, lines 1-8 and 1-7, respectively; Durst: pg. 389,

Introduction, 2nd paragraph with pg. 392, figure 1) wherein the step of requesting

comprises the step of requesting a connection to a simulated ground station from a

spacecraft status for each simulated ground station.

Claim 3. A method as recited in claim 1 (Gold: column 4, lines 45-50; Priore: pg. 270-

271, Problem Solution section, lines 1-8 and 1-7, respectively; Durst: pg. 389,

Introduction, 2nd paragraph with pg. 392, figure 1) wherein the step of requesting

comprises requesting a connection to multiple ground stations, wherein each ground

station has the unique port address and common IP address (Durst: pg. 397, right

column, 2nd paragraph, lines 3-8).

Claim 4. A method as recited in claim 1 (Gold: column 4, lines 45-50; Priore: pg. 270-

271, Problem Solution section, lines 1-8 and 1-7, respectively; Durst: pg. 389,

Introduction, 2nd paragraph with pg. 392, figure 1) wherein the step of requesting

comprises requesting a connection to multiple ground stations, wherein each ground

station has the unique port address and common IP address (Durst: pg. 397, right

column, 2nd paragraph, lines 3-8).

Claim 5. A method as recited in claim 4 (Gold: column 4, lines 45-50; Priore: pg. 270-

271, Problem Solution section, lines 1-8 and 1-7, respectively; Durst: pg. 389,

Introduction, 2nd paragraph with pg. 392, figure 1, pg. 397, right column, 2nd paragraph,

lines 3-8) wherein the step of generating a range server comprises generating the range

server name in response to the unique port address and using that name to instantiate

a range server specific to a unique ground station (Durst: pg. 397, right column, 2nd

paragraph, lines 3-8).

Claim 6. A method as recited in claim 1 (Gold: column 4, lines 45-50; Priore: pg. 270-

271, Problem Solution section, lines 1-8 and 1-7, respectively; Durst: pg. 389,

Introduction, 2nd paragraph with pg. 392, figure 1, pg. 397, right column, 2nd paragraph,

lines 3-8) further comprising the step of providing tracking information for the one of the

plurality of simulated ground stations (Priore: pg. 269, section The Problem; with Durst,

pg. 392, figure 1).

Claim 7. A method of simulating the operation of a spacecraft comprising the steps of

(Gold: abstract): generating range, attitude and elevation data for a plurality of

simulation ground stations (Priore: pg. 269,section The Problem, bullets 1-4) identifying

a desired simulated ground station from the plurality of ground stations in response to a

unique port address (Priore: pg. 270-271, Problem Solution section, lines 1-8 and 1-7,

respectively; Durst: pg. 397, right column, 2nd paragraph, lines 3-8) and, providing

simulated range data for the desired simulated ground station to a real time client (Gold:

column 2, lines 60-64) in response to a unique port addresses (Durst: pg. 397, right

column, 2nd paragraph, lines 3-8).

Claim 8. A method as recited in claim 7 (Gold: abstract; Priore: pg. 269,section The

Problem, bullets 1-4, pg. 270-271, Problem Solution section, lines 1-8 and 1-7,

respectively; Durst: pg. 397, right column, 2nd paragraph, lines 3-8) wherein the step of

identifying comprises the step of generating a simulated range server name and

generating a tracking server name.

Claim 9. A method as recited in claim 7 (Gold: abstract; Priore: pg. 269,section The

Problem, bullets 1-4, pg. 270-271, Problem Solution section, lines 1-8 and 1-7,

respectively; Durst: pg. 397, right column, 2nd paragraph, lines 3-8) wherein the step of

identifying further comprises in response to the step of generating a range server name

and tracking server name, generating server location parameters.

Claim 10. A method as recited in claim 7 (Gold: abstract; Priore: pg. 269,section The

Problem, bullets 1-4, pg. 270-271, Problem Solution section, lines 1-8 and 1-7,

respectively; Durst: pg. 397, right column, 2nd paragraph, lines 3-8) further comprising

the step of generating a connection to one of the plurality of simulated ground stations

(Priore: pg. 269, section The Problem; with Durst, pg. 392, figure 1).

Claim 11. A method as recited in claim 7(Gold: abstract; Priore: pg. 269,section The

Problem, bullets 1-4, pg. 270-271, Problem Solution section, lines 1-8 and 1-7,

respectively; Durst: pg. 397, right column, 2nd paragraph, lines 3-8) wherein the step of

requesting comprises the step of requesting a connection to the multiple ground

stations, wherein each ground station has the unique port address (Durst: pg. 397, right

column, 2nd paragraph, lines 3-8).

Claim 12. A method recited in claim 8 (Gold: abstract; Priore: pg. 269,section The

Problem, bullets 1-4, pg. 270-271, Problem Solution section, lines 1-8 and 1-7,

respectively; Durst: pg. 397, right column, 2nd paragraph, lines 3-8) wherein the step of

generating a simulated range server name comprises generating the range server name

in response to the unique port address and wherein the step of generating a tracking

server name comprises generating the tracking server name in response to the unique

port address (Durst: pg. 397, right column, 2nd paragraph, lines 3-8).

7.   Claims 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by Gold

et al. (U.S. Patent 5,808,921 (1998)) in view of Priore ("A General Purpose Data

Processing System Simulator for Satellite Ground Stations (1997)). Gold et al. teaches

a system for testing an embedded control processor (i.e., emulated spacecraft control

processor and simulation engine) for a spacecraft control processor (abstract); but

doesn't expand the simulation to ground station activity. Priore teaches a method to

model a general class of automatic data processing functions for satellite ground

stations.

At the time the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in

the art to use Priore to modify Gold et al. because of the significant financial expense of

using actual equipment to model daily intergalactic activities.

Claim 13. A spacecraft emulation system comprising (Gold: abstract): a spacecraft

status and control client (Priore: pg. 273, section DPSSGS MODEL OVERVIEW): an

interface coupled to the spacecraft status (Priore: pg.269, section Introduction, bullets 1-

4) and control client for generating identification information for a desired simulated

ground station: a range data generator (Gold: column 3, lines 8-51; with Priore: pg. 269)

for generating simulated range data from a plurality of simulated ground stations (Priore:

pg.273, overview); and a range server coupled to the range data generator and

spacecraft status and control client having the simulated range data for said plurality of

simulated ground stations therein, said range serve providing the simulated range data

to said spacecraft status and control client (Gold: column 3, lines 8-51; with Priore: pg.

269).

Claim 14. A spacecraft emulation system as recited in claim 13 (Gold: abstract, column

3, lines 8-51; with Priore: pg. 269; Priore: pg. 273, section DPSSGS MODEL

OVERVIEW; Priore: pg.269, section Introduction, bullets 1-4) further comprising: a

tracking server coupled elevation and attitude data generator and the spacecraft status

and control client, the tracking server providing elevation and azimuth data to said

spacecraft status and control client.

Claim 15. A spacecraft emulation system as recited in claim 13 (Gold: abstract, column

3, lines 8-51; with Priore: pg. 269; Priore: pg. 273, section DPSSGS MODEL

OVERVIEW; Priore: pg.269, section Introduction, bullets 1-4) wherein said interface,

range data generator, range server, tracking data generator and tracking server are

coupled within a single unit.

Correspondence Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Mr. Tom Stevens whose telephone number is (571) 271-

0365, Monday-Friday (8:00 am- 4:30 pm) or contact Supervisor Mr. Kevin Teska at

(571) 272-3716. The fax number for the group is 703-308-1396.

Any inquires of general nature or relating to the status of this application should

be directed to the Group receptionist whose phone number is (571) 272-1400

November 4, 2004

THS

KEVIN J. TESKA
SUPERVISORY
PATENT EXAMINER